Title

Negative selection allows human primary fibroblasts to tolerate high somatic mutation

loads induced by N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea

Authors

Ronald Cutler[1, 2, =], Johanna Heid[1, =], Shixiang Sun[1], Moonsook Lee[1], Alexander Y.

Maslov[1, 3], Lei Zhang[4], Simone Sidoli[2], Xiao Dong[4, 5], Jan Vijg[1, *]

Affiliations

[1] Department of Genetics, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, NY 10461, USA

[2] Department of Biochemistry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, NY 10461, USA

[3] Laboratory of Applied Genomic Technologies, Voronezh State University of Engineering

Technology, Voronezh 394000, Russia

[4] Institute on the Biology of Aging and Metabolism, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,

MN 55455, USA

[5] Department of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development, University of Minnesota,

Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

[=] Authors contributed equally to this work

[*] Correspondence to J.V. (jan.vijg@einsteinmed.edu)

Summary

With advanced sequencing methods, it has now been shown that thousands of mutations accumulate with age in most human tissues. While there is ample evidence that some mutations can clonally amplify and lead to disease, the total burden of mutations a cell can tolerate without functional decline remains unknown. Here we directly addressed this question by exposing serially cultured human primary fibroblasts to multiple, low doses of N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea and analyzing somatic mutation burden using single-cell whole genome sequencing. The results indicate that mitotically active cells can sustain at least ~56,000 single-nucleotide variants with only a slight adverse effect on growth rate. We provide evidence that such high levels of mutations are tolerated through negative selection against variants in gene coding and non-coding regions, and in sequences associated with genetic pathways for maintaining relevant cellular functions such as growth and cell identity. Since most tissues in adults are non-dividing, these results suggest that somatic mutations in the absence of negative selection may have functionally adverse effects.

Key words

Aging; Somatic mutations; Mutation burden; N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea; Single-cell whole-genome sequencing; Negative selection; Coding regions; Non-coding regions; Cell growth pathways; Human lung fibroblasts

Introduction

Aging is a complex process of continuous decline in cellular and tissue function that is accompanied with increased disease risk[1]. DNA damage is thought to play a central role in this process and may be a universal cause of aging[2]. Among the major molecular consequences of DNA damage during aging are somatic DNA mutations. Somatic mutations are the result of errors during repair or replication of a damaged DNA template and can only be purged via the death of the cell or organism. The accumulation of somatic mutations has since long been implicated as a major cause of aging[3, 4], which is strongly supported by the age-related exponential increase of cancer, a disease known to be caused by mutations[5]. Somatic mutations are difficult to analyze because of their random nature, with very low variant allele frequencies. With the recent emergence of single-cell and single-molecule assays, this situation has changed and we are now able to quantitatively analyze most small mutations, including base substitutions and small insertions and deletions, at high accuracy. Application of such methods has provided ample evidence that somatic mutation rate is far higher than the germline mutation rate and that thousands of somatic mutations accumulate with age in most, if not all, human tissues[6-10], including postmitotic tissues such as the brain[11]. In addition, evidence has emerged that postzygotic, somatic mutations are a cause of a wide variety of human diseases other than cancer[12, 13]. Like cancer, many of these age-related effects may be due to clonally amplified mutations[14-16]. Indeed, in blood, somatic mutations lead to

clonal hematopoiesis, which has been associated with increased risk of age-related

diseases, such as cardiovascular disease, as well as overall mortality[17].

What thus far remains unknown is the possible functional impact, collectively, of

thousands of random mutations accumulating in a non-cancerous cell, for example, by

adversely affecting gene-coding or gene-regulatory sequences relevant for the given cell

type. If so, one would expect a limit to the burden of random mutations a cell can tolerate

or selection against mutations in important functional regions. Here, we directly tested

this hypothesis by treating actively proliferating human primary fibroblasts with low,

repeated doses of N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea (ENU), a powerful mutagen that induces almost

exclusively single-nucleotide variants (SNVs). Our results show that 9 treatment cycles

of ENU treatment over the course of ~24 population doublings linearly increased mutation

frequency up to ~56,000 SNVs per cell, without a major effect on growth rate or cell death.

We show that such a high tolerance for somatic mutations can be explained by negative

selection against potentially deleterious mutations in gene coding and non-coding regions

and in functional genomic regions associated with cell growth. These results suggest that

accumulating somatic mutations may have adverse effects on cellular function when

negative selection is not possible, as is the case in most cells and tissues in adult

organisms, which are not mitotically active[18].

Results

<u>Repeated Mutagen Treatment of Normal Cells Only Slightly Affects Cell Growth</u>

To determine the impact of increased somatic mutation burden on primary human cells *in vitro*, we treated fetal lung fibroblasts (IMR-90) with a sublethal dose of 50 µg/mL of ENU, which was followed by a recovery period of 7 days. For each cycle, 1 million cells were passaged and treated again, and this process was repeated for 9 cycles (Figure 1A; Methods). To monitor cell growth and toxicity, we measured cell number and apoptosis rate at 3 and 7 days after each treatment to assess both short- and long-term effects of the treatment (Methods). We measured cell growth by calculating population doublings (PDs), and found that repeated treatment with ENU gradually decreased cell growth rate over the course of the experiment, as at cycle 9 there were a total of 28.25±1.87 (mean ± standard deviation) PDs for control cells compared to 24.1±1.34 PDs for ENU-treated cells (Figure 1B). The effect of ENU treatment on cell growth was more pronounced at the 3 day time point (Figure 1C) compared to the 7 day time point (Figure 1D), which mostly explains the decrease in overall growth rate (Figure 1B). A larger effect on growth rate at the 3 day timepoint was expected due to known adverse effects of the DNA damage response on cell growth, immediately following mutagen treatment, which then subsides over time. To identify the contribution of cell death to the slight decrease in growth rate due to mutagen exposure, we measured markers of early or late apoptosis at the 3 and 7 day time points (Figures 1E-F and 1G-H). The results showed a slight, but consistent increase in early and late apoptosis in the ENU-treated group as compared to

the control cells at both time points. These results suggest that increased apoptosis may

contribute to the slight adverse effect on cell growth.

To analyze possible effects of a DNA damage response on the control and ENU-treated

cycling cells in more detail, we performed bulk mRNA-sequencing on samples collected

at cycles 1 and 9 for the control group and cycle 9 for the ENU-treated group (Figures

S1A-K; Table S1; Methods). As a positive control for the effect of cell passsaging, we first

compared the control cycle 9 and the control cycle 1 groups, which resulted in 979

significantly differentially expressed genes (DEGs) (Figure 2A; Table S2). We then

performed targeted gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) which showed that cell cycle-

related genes were significantly decreased, while apoptosis-related genes were not

significantly changed (Figures 2B-C). As cells are known to become senescent during

passaging, we also tested for an enrichment of senescence-related genes, which were

found to be significantly increased, as expected (Figure 2D).

To assess the effects of the repeated ENU treatment, we compared the ENU-treated

cycle 9 and the control cycle 9 groups. Unexpectedly, this resulted in only 2 significant

DEGs (Figure 2C; Table S2; Supplementary Note 1). However, after performing GSEA

(which does not rely on p-value thresholds), we found that repeated ENU treatment had

a similar, albeit weaker effect as cell passaging, i.e., a significant decrease of cell cycle-

related genes and a significant increase in senescence-related genes (Figure 2F, 2H). In

contrast to the effect of cell passaging, we found a significant increase in the abundance

of apoptosis-related genes in the ENU-treated cells relative to the controls (Figure 2G),

confirming the results of the direct apoptosis measurements (Figures 1G-H).

Taken together, these phenotypic and molecular data suggest that the observed

decrease in cell growth rate due to repeated ENU treatment (Figure 1B) is, at least in

part, due to increased cell cycle inhibition (Figures 1C, 2F, 2H) and apoptosis (Figures

1E-F, 2G). As the resulting effect sizes due to repeated ENU treatment (i.e. mutation

accumulation) were relatively small, these results demonstrate the resilience of normal

primary cells proliferating in culture to this mutagen, which was previously known to have

low cell toxicity when used at low doses[19]. Next, we analyzed the effect of repeated

ENU treatment on somatic mutation burden.

<u>Repeated Mutagen Treatment of Normal Cells Results in Extremely High Mutation</u>

<u>Burden</u>

Somatic DNA mutations in normal (non-cancerous) cells, which are mostly unique to each

cell, cannot be distinguished from sequencing artifacts after bulk whole genome

sequencing. Hence, we used our established and highly accurate single-cell whole

genome sequencing assay [20, 21] to analyze mutation burden in 21 single-cells from

control and ENU-treated groups collected in 3 independent batches at cycles 3, 6, and 9

from the repeated ENU treatment experiment (Figure 1A, Table S3, Methods). Cells for

mutation analysis were collected at the 7-day time point after each treatment cycle, as

DNA damage responses should be abated by that time and all mutations fixed. After

correction for genome coverage, sensitivity, and technical artifacts (Figures S2A-G;

Methods), we found that the number of estimated single nucleotide variants (SNVs) per cell in the control group started at 2,434±406 at cycle 1, which increased to 19,064±823 in the ENU-treated group at cycle 3, (~7.8-fold increase), and then 33,098±1,785 in the ENU-treated group at cycle 6 (~1.7-fold increase compared to cycle 3). At cycle 9, SNVs in the ENU-treated group reached a maximum of 55,954±4,066 SNVs (~1.7 fold increase compared to the cycle 6 ENU-treated group and ~32 fold increase compared to cycle 1 controls). Importantly, there was no significant difference between control cells at cycle 1 and 9, ruling out that the increase in SNVs in ENU-treated cells was due to passaging. We checked for the possibility of clonal expansion by looking at shared mutations between cells within each group, but only detected 8 SNVs that were shared between 2 cells in the ENU-treated group at cycle 6 (Figure S2F). This indicates a shared common ancestor, but not clonal expansion. The increase in SNVs in ENU-treated cells was orthogonally validated using our recently developed single-molecule assay (Figures 3B and S3A; Table S4; Supplementary Note 2)[22]. We conclude that our treatment paradigm increased mutational load to high superphysiological levels without serious toxicity, with the increase in SNVs over the course of the experiment occurring linearly in a cycle-dependent manner (Figures 3C-D).

While ENU is known to mainly induce base substitution mutations through alkylation damage, the estimated number of small insertions and deletions (INDELs) per cell was also observed to increase due to ENU treatment, starting from 123±49 in the control group at cycle 1, to 246±49 in the ENU-treated group at cycle 3 (~1.8-fold increase); however, there was no further increase at cycles 6 and 9 (Figures S2I-J). As with SNVs, there was no significant difference in the amount of estimated INDELs between control cells from

cycle 1 and cycle 9. INDELs have been previously observed to be induced by ENU, albeit

at low frequencies[23], and could be caused by DNA polymerase slippage during DNA

replication at sites of alkylation damage. While the lack of an increase in INDELs after

cycle 3 in the ENU-treated group may be suggestive of negative selection acting to

prevent a further increase, this finding remains inconclusive due to the low amount of

observed INDELs per cell (~20 INDELs per cell).

We then characterized the underlying SNV mutational processes in the aggregated

mutations from the cells at all cycles within the control and ENU-treated groups

(Supplementary Note 3; Methods). The ENU-treated group showed an increase in the

relative contribution of thymine-to-adenine (T>A) and thymine-to-cytosine (T>C) base

transversions in both the single-cell and single-molecule data (Figures 4A, S3B, S4A).

This is in keeping with previously published ENU-induced mutational spectra by us and

others[19, 22]. We then inferred SNV mutational signatures *de novo* using non-negative

matrix factorization with a reference set of mutations from previous single-cell whole

genome studies [20, 24-26] (Figures S4H-I) and identified two signatures, named SBSA

and SBSB, which were dominant in the cells of the ENU-treated and control groups,

respectively (Figure 4B). Importantly, we found that SBSA resembled the SIGNAL human

signature associated with ENU-treatment, validating the source of the induced mutations

(Figure 4C)[27]. We then compared our *de novo* signatures to those in the COSMIC

database and found that SBSB was most similar to SBS5 a 'clock-like' mutational

signature that has been previously found to correlate with cellular replicataion during

aging [24, 28] (Figure 4D). Though relatively few INDELs were observed (369 in total),

we also provide a characterization of their mutational spectra (Figure S4K;
Supplementary Note 3).

<u>Protection Against ENU-induced Mutation Accumulation of Damaging Coding and Non-</u>
<u>Coding Variants</u>

Based on our initial results showing that the mutation burden of primary cells could linearly

increase to an estimated ~56,000 SNVs per cell (Figure 3A), i.e., ~10 times the SNV

burden typically found in normal cells from aged tissues[6], with only a slight effect on cell

growth and death (Figures 1B, 1E-H), we hypothesized that the sustained cell survival

and growth could be explained in part by negative selection against harmful mutations.

Our dataset presented a unique opportunity to test this hypothesis as there were a total

of 108,600 SNVs observed, which could provide a sufficient amount of power for

statistical testing of selection pressure (Figure S2H). To do this, we first annotated the

SNVs for different types of coding region variants: synonymous (non-protein-altering) and

non-synonymous (protein-altering) using the Ensemble Variant Effect Predictor

program[29], and then determined the frequency of these variants (Methods). This

revealed significant cycle-dependent increases in both synonymous and non-

synonymous variants in the ENU-treated group relative to the controls, with non-

synonymous variants reaching up to 80±35.3 variants per cell (73%±5.6% of all coding

variants per cell) at cycle 9 in the ENU-treated cells (Figure 5A).

We then measured selection pressure by calculating Log_2(observed/expected)

(Log_2(O/E)) ratios of the variants observed within each group, which compares the

frequency of observed variants to the frequency of variants expected by chance, i.e.,

neutral selection. The number of expected variants was estimated for each cell by

generating 10,000 instances of randomly shuffled mutations, which controlled for variation

in genomic coverage, mutational signatures, and sequence context of the observed

mutations [30] (Methods). Since the main hindrance in testing for selection is the low

number of mutations in normal cells (i.e., the control group), we used simulations to

determine if the frequency of observed variants was high enough to obtain sufficient

power for statistical testing at various Log_2(O/E) ratios (Methods). The results of these

simulations indicated that many of the Log_2(O/E) ratios obtained in the ENU-treated

groups were sufficiently powered, while almost none of the Log_2(O/E) ratios in the control

groups were sufficiently powered (Figures S5A-B; Table S5). Thus, we focused our

analysis on the ENU-treated cells (see Figure S5 for analysis of control cells). Finally, to

account for the known effect of DNA repair to deplete mutations within transcribed regions

through transcription coupled repair (TCR) and mismatch repair (MMR)[31, 32], we

normalized the Log_2(O/E) ratios of variants within transcribed regions by the Log_2(O/E)

ratio of mutations within intronic regions (assumed to be independent of selection)

(Methods).

With this approach, we found that the Log_2(O/E) ratios of non-synonymous variants at

cycles 6 and 9 in the ENU-treated group were ~ -0.2, which was significantly lower than

what would be expected by chance and indicative of negative selection (Figures 5B and

S5C-E, right panels). These Log_2(O/E) ratios corresponded to a ~20% reduction in

mutation burden which was a decrease of 14.5±9.1, and 19.9±12.5 non-synonymous

variants per cell at cycles 6 and 9, respectively (Figure 5C). In regards to synonymous

variants, the frequency of these was too low, which rendered the Log_2(O/E) ratios of these

variants to be insufficiently powered (Figures 5B and S5C-E, left panels; Table S5).

We then sought to verify if negative selection against non-synonymous variants could

also be shown using a method to calculate dN/dS ratios (i.e. the dNdScv program), an

alternative measure of selection [33] (Methods). It should be noted that there are

important differences between our method to calculate Log_2(O/E) ratios and the dNdScv

method. Unlike our O/E method, which empirically estimates expected mutations via

genome-wide simulations accounting for coverage and mutational signatures, the

dNdScv method relies on probabilistic modeling, assuming uniform genomic coverage

and abundant mutations in coding regions. Therefore, the assumptions of this method

made it less suitable for our single-cell whole genome sequencing data type, i.e., variable

genome coverage and a limited number of coding mutations. As expected, in contrast to

Log_2(O/E) ratios, the dN/dS ratios were ~1 and indicative of neutral selection (Figure S6A;

See Supplementary Note 4 for detailed comparison between methods).

To identify the contribution of the various types of non-synonymous variants to the

negative selection signal observed in the ENU-treated group, we stratified the non-

synonymous variants into stop retained, missense, start lost, stop gained, and stop lost

variants and calculated their respective Log_2(O/E) ratios (Supplementary Note 6). This

revealed that missense variants made up the majority of non-synonymous variants in the

ENU-treated group (Figure 5D) and also that the negative selection signal was driven

almost exclusively by missense variants (Figures 5E and S5F-H).

To further test whether the apparent negative selection against non-synonymous variants

persisted after normalising for local mutation input and coverage, we examined the ratio

of non-synonymous to synonymous changes (N/S). Synonymous variants, assumed to

be functionally neutral, occur in the same sequence contexts and at the same depth as

non-synonymous variants, so they serve as an internal baseline for the true mutation rate

introduced by ENU. A deficit of non-synonymous variants relative to this neutral baseline

is therefore attributable to negative selection rather than to sequencing bias or differences

in mutagenesis. Although the raw N/S ratios were similar between control and treated

cells (Figure 5F), applying the O/E method to these ratios produced Log_2(O/E) ratios

significantly below zero at cycles 6 and 9 in the ENU-treated group (Figures 5G, S5I-J),

corroborating the ~20 % selective loss of non-synonymous variants (Figure 5B, right

panel).

In an attempt to gain insight in selection pressure at the gene level, we mapped the non-

synonymous variants to the COSMIC Cancer Gene Census gene set and identified a total

of 75 cancer driver genes containing nonsynonymous variants (Methods). However, low

variant counts of ~1 per gene on average essentially constrained meaningful conclusions

when assessing selection pressure with either the O/E or dNdScv methods (Table S6).

Next, we tested if variants in non-coding regions were under selection pressure. First, we

used the Variant Effect Predictor program [29] to annotate variants in non-coding regions,

i.e., introns, intergenic, 5'UTR, 3'UTR, and splice sites. As with the coding variants, non-

coding variants showed cycle-dependent increases in the ENU-treated group relative to

the controls, with variants in intronic and intergenic regions accounting for 49.9% and

35.1% of all non-coding variants, respectively (Figure 5H). For ENU-treated groups at all

cycles, Log_2(O/E) ratios of intronic region variants were ~ -0.08, significantly less than

what would be expected by chance (Figure 5I). Since the vast majority of introns (with the

exception of splice sites and other conserved non-coding elements) do not contain

functional sequences and are evolving at neutrality in the germline, but are still subject to

DNA repair such as TCR and MMR[31, 32], we interpret the negative $Log_2(O/E)$ ratios in

these regions as a signal of DNA repair rather than negative selection. As described at

the beginning of this section, we use the intron $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio to account for the

confounding effect of DNA repair on the $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio. In intergenic regions for ENU-

treated groups at all cycles, we found that the $Log_2(O/E)$ was ~0.13, significantly greater

than what would be expected by chance and indicative of mutation enrichment (Figure

5I). Similar to introns, the vast majority of intergenic regions lack functional sequences

and are evolving at neutrality in the germline. However, DNA repair activity in these

regions is known to be substantially reduced and likely explains the positive $Log_2(O/E)$

ratios[34, 35]. However, we cannot discount the possibility of an alternative interpretation

of these results by a possible limitation of the O/E analysis method (Supplementary Note

5).

Out of all the non-coding variants, only $Log_2(O/E)$ ratios of variants occurring in 3'

untranslated regions (UTR), and splice regions in the ENU-treated group at cycle 9 were

significantly less than 0 (Figures 5I S5K-M), which was indicative of negative selection

and supported by previous studies on germline selection pressures[34, 36, 37]. The

$Log_2(O/E)$ ratios of 3' UTRs and splice sites in the ENU-treated group at cycle 9

corresponded to ~25% reduction in mutation burden, a decrease of 19.3±12.5 and

6.2±2.7 variants per cell, respectively (Figure 5J).

Taken together, these results show that potentially damaging variants in both coding and

a subset of non-coding regions did not accumulate to levels that would be expected in the

context of the extremely high mutation burden induced by ENU treatment and instead

were subject to negative selection, resulting in protection of critical genes supporting

essential cellular functions *in vitro*. These results explain how the population of cells

exposed to repeated mutagen treatments was able to avoid a dramatic decline in growth

rate (Figure 1B), even as overall SNV burden continued to increase linearly throughout

the experiment (Figure 3C-D). Of note, the selection pressure analysis was limited to

mutations that were actually physically detected, which are ~20% of the ~56,000

estimated mutations at cycle 9 in the ENU-treated group (Figures 3A and S2H). Hence,

these results have relevance for the much smaller numbers of SNVs that are estimated

to accumulate during normal aging, e.g., from ~3,000 in human B lymphocytes to ~ 9,000

in human hepatocytes[6].

<u>Pathways Supporting Fibroblast Growth and Cell Identity are Protected from Mutation</u>

<u>Accumulation</u>

To gain insights on selective pressures at broader levels associated with cellular function,

we investigated if important gene sets that were active in proliferating human fibroblasts

were under negative selection. To do this, we analyzed the SNVs across annotated

functional genomic regions relevant to human lung fibroblasts (i.e. exons, upstream

promoters, and enhancers) that were grouped into various gene sets[38-40]. We then

calculated the frequency of SNVs within these regions as well as the Log_2(O/E) ratios

(while accounting for the effects of DNA repair by intron Log_2(O/E) ratio normalization, as

described above; Methods).

First, we analyzed non-expressed genes and expressed genes as determined by our bulk

mRNA-sequencing data (Figures S1A-B; Table S7; Methods). In keeping with the

previous analyses of other regions (e.g. exonic and intronic regions), we found cycle-

dependent increases of SNV frequency in non-expressed and expressed regions for the

ENU-treated group relative to the controls (Figure 6A). Log_2(O/E) ratios of SNVs in

expressed genes were significantly below 0 at all cycles in the ENU-treated group,

indicative of negative selection (Figures 6B and S7A-C, right panels). In contrast, the

Log_2(O/E) ratios of SNVs in non-expressed genes did not significantly deviate from the

expectation in the ENU-treated group at cycle 9, indicating neutral selection (Figures 6B

left panel, S6A-C, left panels). Next, we further subdivided the expressed genes into

nonessential and essential gene sets based on previous *in vitro* screens and repeated

the same analysis[41, 42]. This showed increased SNV frequency in the ENU-treated

group relative to the controls (Figure 6C), along with a Log_2(O/E) ratio significantly below

0 at cycle 9 in the ENU-treated group, indicative of negative selection (Figures 6D and

S7D-F, right panels). Of note, this is in agreement with global dN/dS ratios on truncating

mutations across 17 genes essential from a large-scale study sampling the normal oral

epithelium[43]. As negative selection is expected to be generally weak due to the diploid

nature of the human genome[33, 44-46], but stronger in haploinsufficient regions, we

subdivided expressed genes into haplosufficient (pLI > 0.1) and haploinsufficient (pLI <

0.9) gene sets based on a large scale study of protein-coding genetic variation[47]. As

expected, analysis of these gene sets showed increased SNV frequency in the ENU-

treated group relative to the controls (Figure 6E). Log_2(O/E) ratios were significantly below

0 in both haplosufficient and haploinsufficient gene sets for the ENU-treated cells at cycle

9. However, only the ENU-treated group at cycle 6 showed $Log_2(O/E)$ ratios significantly

below 0 for the haploinsufficient gene set and not the haplosufficient gene set, suggesting

overall stronger negative selection of haploinsufficient genes, as would be expected

(Figures 6F and S7G-I). In further support of this, when the $Log_2(O/E)$ was compared

between haplosufficient and haploinsufficient gene sets for ENU-treated cells at cycle 9,

we found that the $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio was considerably lower for the haploinsufficient genes

(-0.37±0.16) as compared to the haplosufficient genes (-0.28±0.04). In summary, these

results suggest that damaging SNVs are selectively purged from functional genomic

regions based on expression status, essentiality, and dosage sensitivity, extending our

previous results on negative selection of damaging SNVs in coding and non-coding

regions.

Moving to the pathway level, we identified 399 gene ontology (GO) biological processes

as significantly enriched in the set of expressed genes from our bulk RNA-seq data

(Figure S7J; Table S8; Methods). As expected, the mean frequency of SNVs within each

pathway showed significant cycle-dependent increases of SNV frequency in the ENU-

treated group relative to the controls (Figure 6G; Table S9). At the global level, $Log_2(O/E)$

ratios of the identified pathways in the ENU-treated group showed a cycle-dependent

decrease, suggesting widespread negative selection at the pathway level (Figures 6H,

S7K-L; Table S9). At cycle 9 in the ENU-treated group, 6 pathways showed $Log_2(O/E)$

ratios significantly below 0, indicative of negative selection. The pathways under negative

selection were characterized as those related to basic cellular processes supporting lung

fibroblast cell growth *in vitro* and cellular identity, i.e., 'response to oxidative stress'

(GO:0006979), 'respiratory tube development' (GO:0030323), 'respiratory system

development' (GO:0006979), 'regulation of response to DNA damage stimulus' (GO:2001020), 'proteasome-mediated ubiquitin-dependent protein catabolic process' (GO:0043161), and 'cellular response to chemical stress' (GO:0062197) (Figures 6I-K; Table S9). To ensure that the pathways we had identified to be under negative selection were not false positives, we repeated the pathway analysis, but employed bootstrapping to randomly shuffle genes amongst pathways before calculating the Log_2(O/E) ratios (Figures S8A-C; Methods). The results of this served as a negative control, which had no significant overlap with the pathways we identified to be under significant negative slection pressure, providing a validation of our results (Figures S8D-E).

In summary, these results suggest that in the context of very high mutation burden, pathways supporting oxidative stress, cellular identity, and protein homeostasis in proliferating cells *in vitro*, are protected from the accumulation of SNVs by negative selection. Importantly, these pathways are biologically significant, as they appear to be relevant to the conditions of *in vitro* cell culture and to the unique charecteristics of lung fibroblast, highlighting the functional importance of preventing mutation accumulation. This shows how negative selection allows a population of dividing cells to survive extremely high mutation burden and underscores the impact of random somatic SNVs on essential cellular functions.

Discussion

Somatic mutations are known since the 1970s to be the main cause of cancer[48]. Mainly because of the exponential increase in cancer risk with age[49], aging itself has been

suggested to be caused by the accumulation of somatic mutations[3, 8, 50]. Testing this

hypothesis has long been constrained by a lack of methods to quantitatively analyze

somatic mutations in normal tissues during aging. However, both single-cell and single-

molecule methods have recently been developed to accurately quantify randomly

accumulating SNVs and INDELs. Using these methods, we and others have

demonstrated that somatic mutation burden is far higher than expected based on the

known germline mutation frequency and increases with age up to several thousands of

mutations per cell in aged subjects depending on the tissue[6, 9]. However, a causal

relationship of increased mutation burden and age-related functional decline and disease

risk remains untested. Instead, attention has been focused on clonally amplified somatic

mutations and their causal relationship to non-cancerous and age-related diseases[14,

51].

In the present study, we tested for a possible limit to somatic mutation accumulation in a

cell culture model in which high levels of somatic mutations were induced by multiple low

doses of the powerful mutagen ENU (Figure 1A). In this system we were able to linearly

increase the somatic mutation burden to ~56,000 SNVs per cell, over 30-fold higher than

untreated control cells (Figure 3A). Remarkably, this supraphysiological mutation load

only slightly impacted cell growth rate (Figure 1B), suggesting that most cells can sustain

an astounding level of genetic damage. The most straightforward explanation for these

findings is that the mammalian genome is highly robust, and that even very high numbers

of point mutations are unlikely to adversely affect cellular function. Indeed, this would be

supported by results from a recent study in which as many as ~30,000 SNVs were

observed in intestinal crypts of elderly patients with genetic defects in DNA mismatch

repair[52].

An alternative explanation for the high tolerance of actively proliferating cells to mutation

accumulation is negative selection against mutations in genomic regions important for

cell survival. Evidence for negative selection against somatic mutations has been found

in tumors[46]. However, in cancer, positive selection is the dominant force, arising from

mutations in cancer driver genes[33]. Evidence for negative selection of somatic

mutations in normal cells is scarce because of the much lower frequency of somatic

mutations, which limits robust statistical testing. Our present analysis of untreated control

cells indeed suffered from this same limitation, and we were unable to convincingly

demonstrate negative selection of mutations in these cells (Figure S5D). However, our

ENU-treated cells did yield a sufficiently high number of SNVs to test for negative

selection (Figure S2B). With this, we found multiple lines of evidence for negative

selection acting on potentially deleterious coding and non-coding variants. While the

frequency of both synonymous and non-synonymous variants increased linearly with

ENU treatment (Figure 5A), deeper analysis using observed vs. expected ($Log_2(O/E)$)

ratios revealed a significantly lower frequency of high impact non-synonymous variants,

especially missense variants, in the ENU-treated cells as compared to our null model

(Figures 5A-E). This suggests that an actively proliferating population of fibroblasts has

the capacity to selectively purge the most harmful coding mutations from their genomes,

preserving cellular fitness despite the extremely high number of random mutations

accumulating genome wide, and agrees with the selection pressures found from

analyzing germline mutations[47, 53-55]. Additionaly, negative selection was also

detected in non-coding regions for variants occurring in 3' untranslated regions and splice

sites (which made up ~1.1% of all the observed non-coding variants), which is in

agreement with recent literature analyzing selective pressures in these regions [37]

(Figures 5I-J).

Our analysis of gene sets and pathways revealed negative selection to also be acting at

a broader level. In the primary lung fibroblasts treated with ENU, we found a significant

decrease in the frequency of mutations in genomic regions of actively expressed

pathways such as oxidative stress, respiratory system development, and response to

DNA damage (Figure 6F). As these pathways are relevant to our *in vitro* experimental

conditions (Figure 1A) and the cell type used in the experiments, this suggests that

despite the massive somatic mutational burden across the genome overall, somatic

mutations that occur in pathways critical for cellular survival have a damaging effect.

Our work provides the first evidence that very high numbers of somatic mutations,

collectively, may have a functional impact on normal cells independent of clonally

amplified mutations. However, because a supraphysioloigical amount of mutations was

required to detect negative selection, this puts into question whether there is an effect of

negative selection on the much lower numbers of somatic mutations that accumulate

during aging. In this respect, it should be noted that the actual number of SNVs measured

is much smaller that the ~56,000 estimated based on genome coverage and sensitivity,

i.e., no more than ~12,000 (Figure 3A and S2H). This is not that so much above the about

2,000 and 5,000 SNVs per cell, depending on the cell type analyzed, that have been

estimated to have accumulated at old age [6]. Hence, it is conceivable that negative

selection is a general mechanism to eliminate somatic mutations that adversely impact

cell function, similar to purifying selection in the germline. However, such a mechanism

would only work in actively proliferating cells when negative selection is possible, similar

to the situation in tumors. In normal adult subjects, cell division rate is very low with few

exceptions, most notably the lymphoid and intestinal systems [15]. In human B

lymphocytes, we previously demonstrated that SNVs accumulate with age much slower

in the functional part of the genome than in the genome overall, indicating negative

selection of mutations arising during the process of B cell aging[56]. By contrast, somatic

mutations accumulating in non-dividing adult cells will inevitably affect coding or

regulatory sequences associated with the particular function these cells are programmed

to carry out. However, such mutations cannot be cleared through negative selection in

the absence of a relevant cell fitness advantage (e.g., cell growth).

As a limitation of our study, we should point out that we only analyzed SNVs, and the few

small insertions and deletions induced by ENU. However, SNVs are much less likely to

have a functional impact than genome structural variants (SVs), including large deletions,

translocations, and copy number variants. Indeed, this is clearly indicated for INDELs,

which in our present study did not linearly accumulate during the ENU treatment (Figures

S2I-J). Thus far, there is very little information about somatic SVs, which cannot be

detected accurately, either using single-cell or single-molecule methods[57]. While their

relative frequency is much lower than that of SNVs, SVs can have a major phenotypic

impact, as indicated by germline SVs in human diseases[58]. SVs are much more likely

to adversely affect cell function than SNVs, but unless they result in cell death, a

mechanism to select against them in non-dividing cells *in vivo* during aging is difficult to

imagine.

Data Availability

Raw sequencing data has been deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive under BioProject accession PRJNA1129131. Processed gene expression data has been deposited in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus database under accession GSE271867. Processed variant call files have been deposited in the NCBI dbSNP database and will be made available upon acceptance.

Code Availability

Scripts used for processing and analyzing data have been deposited at: figshare.com/articles/software/Negative_selection_allows_human_primary_fibroblasts_t o_tolerate_high_somatic_mutation_loads_induced_by_N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea/26110453

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by National Institute of Health grants: T32GM007491 (R.C.) T32AG023475 (R.C.), U19AG056278 (J.V.), U01HL145560 (J.V.), U01ES029519 (J.V.), P01AG017242 (J.V.), P01AG047200 (J.V.), RF1AG068908 (J.V.), and P30AG038072 (J.V.). Other funding sources: US Department of Defense grant BC180689P1 (J.V.), Glenn Foundation for Medical Research Postdoctoral Fellowships in Aging Research (J.H.), The Michael J. Fox Foundation (J.V.), and The Paul F. Glenn Center for the Biology of Human Aging at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine (J.V.).

Author Contributions

A.Y.M., and J.V. conceived this study and designed the experiments. J.H., M.S., and A.Y.M performed the experiments. R.C., J.H., and S.S. analyzed the data. X.D. provided guidance on the data analysis. R.C., J.H., and J.V. wrote the manuscript.

Declaration of interests

M.L., A.Y.M., X.D., and J.V. are co-founders and shareholders of SingulOmics Corp. A.Y.M., and J.V. are co-founders of MutagenTech Inc. Other authors declare no conflict of interest.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

The authors employed ChatGPT for spelling and grammar checks during this work's preparation. They have reviewed and edited the content accordingly, assuming full responsibility for the publication's content.

STAR Methods

<u>Cell culture and treatment</u>

Human IMR-90 primary fibroblasts were obtained from the American Tissue Culture Collection (ATCC; LOT number 70020198). They were cultured in DMEM (Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium, from ATCC) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS,

Gibco/Life Technologies) and 1% Penicillin-Streptomycin solution (Gibco/Life

Technologies) at 3% oxygen and 37°C. Cells obtained from ATCC were at passage 11 at

arrival and were cultured for an additional 5 passages before the start of the experiment.

At the beginning of each cycle, $1*10^6$ human primary lung fibroblasts (IMR-90) cells were

plated and allowed to expand for 24 hours. Cells were then treated with 50 µg/mL N-ethyl-

N-nitrosourea (ENU) and allowed to recover for 3 days. Cells were then collected and

assayed for cell number viability for the 3-day time point. Of the collected cells, $1*10^6$ cells

were re-plated and then allowed another 4 days to recover and expand until they were

collected to assess cell number and viability for the 7-day time point. This procedure was

repeated for 9 consecutive cycles over the course of ~10 weeks. This experiment was

repeated 3 times to create 3 independent biological replicates. Cells were isolated at the

7-day time point at cycles 1, 3, 6, and 9 for somatic mutation analysis and at cycles 1 and

9 for transcriptome analysis.

<u>Cell growth and apoptosis assays</u>

Cells were counted using the ViaCount assay (Cytek) on a Guava EasyCyte flow

cytometer to assess cell number and viability at each time point. Apoptosis rates were

determined utilizing the Nexin assay (Cytek) on the same machine for experiments A and

B. Population doublings (PDs) is defined as how many times a population of cells as

doubled over a given period of time, as was calculated as: PD = 3.32* ($\log_{10}$ (number of

cells counted) – $\log_{10}$ (number of seeded cells)). The cumulative sum is then plotted. The

seeded cell number was always $1*10^6$ cells.

Bulk mRNA transcriptome analysis

RNA was extracted from frozen cell pellets using the Zymo DNA/RNA extraction kit

(Microprep plus D7005) according to the manufacturer's instructions and quantified using

a Qubit kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). Libraries for mRNA analysis were prepared

and sequenced using 150 paired-end mode on an Illumina Novaseq platform by

Novogene Corp Inc., CA. Raw sequence reads were processed using the nf-core RNA-

Seq pipeline (version 3.1.0) to obtain gene expression levels[59, 60]. Gene filtering was

performed using the zPKM program (Figure S1A)[61]. Count normalization and

differential expression testing was performed using DESeq2 [62] where the design was

set to test for the effect of the cycle-condition variable while controlling for the batch

variable (Supplementary Note 1). Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) was performed

using the clusterProfiler program [63] along with the SenMayo[64], KEGG DNA repair,

and KEGG apoptosis gene sets[65].

Single-cell isolation, whole-genome amplification, library preparation, and sequencing

Single-cells were isolated using the CellRaft AIR system (Cell Microsystems). The

CellRaft array was prepared following the manufacturer's instruction and washed three

times for 3 minutes with warm PBS before addition of cell suspension. 1,000 cells were

seeded in 1ml for one CellRaft array. Cells were allowed to settle for 3-4 hours at 37°C

before isolation. Then, the raft was carefully washed with warm medium to remove

potential debris and dead cells. Individual rafts containing one cell were deposited in PCR

tubes with 2.5 µl PBS and stored at -80°C until further processing. Single-cell whole-

genome amplification and library preparation for WGS was performed as previously

described [12]. In brief, single-cells were whole genome-amplified using SCMDA and

subject to quality control using a locus dropout test[66]. Libraries were prepared using a

NEBNext Ultra II FS kit (NEB). Library quantity and size were assessed with a Qubit kit

and TapeStation, respectively. WGS libraries were sequenced using the 150 paired-end

mode on an Illumina Novoseq platform by Novogene Corp Inc., CA.

Single-cell whole-genome read alignment and mutation calling

Data analysis was performed as previously described[21]. Briefly, raw sequencing data

underwent quality control using FastQC [67] and Trim Galore [68], followed by alignment

to the human hg19 reference genome using the GATK best practices pipeline [69]. This

included marking adapters, sequence alignment, base quality score recalibration, and

variant calling for germline variants using GATK HaplotypeCaller. SCcaller (version 2.0)

[21] was then employed to call somatic single-nucleotide variations (SNVs) and small

insertions and deletions (INDELs), adjusting for allelic amplification bias using known

germline variants (Figures S2A-C; Table S10). Estimated mutation burden was calculated

as follows:

$$\text{Estimated somatic SNVs|INDELs per cell} = \frac{\text{observed somatic SNVs|INDELs}}{\frac{surveyed\ genome\ (bp)\ *\ sensitivity}{size\ of\ genome\ (bp)}}$$

<u>Mutation filtering and identification of technical artifacts in single-cell whole-genome</u>

<u>mutation data</u>

Overlapping SNVs and INDELs were observed amongst the single-cells from batches 2

and 3 (Figures S2D-E; Table S3). Since this was not observed in the first batch, it is

unlikely that these mutations are the result of clonal amplification. Mutations that were

shared between all cells within a batch were thus considered to be germline and were

filtered out prior to downstream analysis (Figures S2F-G).

Technical artifacts inherent to single-cell MDA library preparation steps, such as

overheating during cell lysis or whole genome amplification, can be identified by their

specific mutational signatures scE and scF[70]. We checked for the presence of these

signatures and found scF to be present in the signature extracted from control cells at

cycle 1 (Figure S4A). The scF technical artifact is characterized by higher than expected

cytosine-to-thymine (C>T) transversions at G<u>C</u>N contexts (Figures S4C-D). Thus, control

cells from cycle 1 were excluded from the downstream mutational signature analyses.

In an attempt to account for the C>T transition artifacts in control cells at cycle 1, we

compared the proportion of the C>T transitions in control cells at cycle 1 to control cells

at cycle 9, which do not show any mutational signatures with similarity to the scF

sequencing artifact mutational signature [70]and have mutation spectra previously

observed for IMR90 cells [71]. We found that this artifact increased the proportion of C>T

transitions by 18%±1%. With this, we estimated the amount of artifactual C>T transitions

in control cells at cycle 1, subtracted this from the observed mutation burden, and then

re-estimated the SNVs per cell (Figure S4J). This better matches what would be expected

for cells being passaged in culture (i.e. insignificant difference) and is in line with

previously published data from our lab, considering the relatively low amount of cell

population doublings throughout the whole experiment (i.e. ~30) [71].

<u>Mutation signature analysis</u>

The MutationalPatterns program [72] use used to analyze mutational spectra and

signature analysis. We obtained a diverse set of samples from SomaMutDB [73] to use

as the background reference for the updated mutational signature analysis. These were

single-cell whole genome sequencing samples from 10 fibroblast cells [20], 199 brain

cells [26],and 53 lung cells [25], where genomic DNA was amplified with either Multiple

Displacement Amplification (MDA) or Primary Template-directed Amplification (PTA)

(Figure S4H).To determine the number of mutational signatures to be extracted from the

data, a non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) rank survey was employed which resulted

in 2 factors (Figures S4B, S4I). *De novo* signatures were extracted and then compared

to those from the COSMIC and SIGNAL databases using cosine similarity [74, 75]. We

also provide results of the NMF rank survey and *de novo* signature extraction when

excluding reference samples (Figures S4B-E).

<u>Variant annotation</u>

Observed mutations in each single-cell and simulations of single-cells (where mutations

were randomly re-distributed as described in the section below) were annotated using the

Ensembl Variant Effect Prediction program (version 110.1) and the given 'Consequences'

annotation was used for downstream analysis [29]. In the case where mutations were

predicted to lead to more than 1 unique consequence (i.e. multiple entries of the same

mutation), the highest ranking annotation that occurred in the resulting output was kept

which resulted in a 1:1 mapping of mutations and consequences. In the case where

mutations occurred in a region that overlapped multiple possible consequences (e.g.

splice region variant and intron variant), we classified this mutation to be consistent with

the consequence that occurred first in this annotation (e.g. splice region, if multiple

annotation was splice region variant and intron variant). For mutations annotated as splice

variants (splice_acceptor_variant, splice_donor_variant, splice_donor_5th_base_variant,

splice_region_variant,splice_donor_region_variant, splice_polypyrimidine_tract_variant),

we classified these mutations as 'splice.' Synonymous variants were classified as

mutations annotated as synonymous_variant and stop_retained_variant. Non-

synonymous variants were classified as mutations annotated as missense_variant,

start_lost, stop_gained, and stop_lost.

<u>Selection analysis of annotated variants</u>

Selection analysis was performed by first creating 10,000 simulations of each single-cell

in our dataset to be as the null expectation (i.e. neutral selection) where mutations are

randomly re-distributed throughout the genome. This was done using the

SigProfilerSimulator program[30], where for each single-cell, observed mutations were

randomly re-distributed across the genome while accounting for cell-specific sequencing

coverage, mutational signatures, and nucleotide contexts.

Log$_2$(observed/expected) ratios (Log$_2$(O/E)) were calculated for each single-cell, as well

as by group where mutations from all cells are pooled, by first summing the frequency of

annotated consequences of all single-cells and their respective simulations within each

group. The Log$_2$(O/E) ratio was then calculated with respect to each simulation (resulting

in 10,000 Log$_2$(O/E) ratios per cell/group) as follows:

664
$$Log_2(O/E) = Log_2 \frac{(observed\ consequence\ freq. + 1)}{(simulated\ consequence\ freq. + 1)}$$

666 A permutation test was then used to determine the p-value of the observed consequence

667 frequency where the simulated consequence frequency served as the null distribution

668 and is as follows:

669
$$p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\ (simulated\ consequence\ freq._{.i} \geq observed\ consequence\ freq.)$$

Where p is the permutation test p-value, n is the number of permutations (i.e. 10,000), i

is the i-th permutation, and I is the indicator function, which equals 1 if the condition inside

is true, and 0 otherwise.

We performed a power analysis to determine how many observed variants are required

to obtain reliable statistical results at varying Log$_2$(O/E) ratios. To do this, we used the

mutation data from ENU-treated cells to obtain the relationship between the standard

deviation in the number of expected variants given the number of observed variants for

common types of variants that were identified. We fit a gamma GLM with a log link to

model standard deviation as a function of log-transformed observed variant count. The

model showed excellent fit (residual deviance = 3.19 on 144 df vs. null deviance = 147.37

on 145 df; dispersion = 0.020), with log-transformed observed variant count as a highly

significant predictor irrespective of the variant type ($p < 2 \times 10^{-16}$) (Figure S5A). With this,

we then calculated Log_2(O/E) ratios by simulating 10,000 instances of expected variant

counts while varying the observed variant counts from 1-1,000. We then varied the

Log_2(O/E) ratios from 0-1 by multiplying the observed variant count by a scaling factor

before calculating the Log_2(O/E) ratio. Finally, we calculated p-values for the Log_2(O/E)

ratios using a permutation test as described previously.

The power analysis demonstrated how varying the observed variant count affects the p-

value of the Log_2(O/E) ratio at different levels. Importantly, this analysis provided us with

estimates of how many observed variants were required to achieve sufficient power (p-

value < 0.05) (i.e. obtain reliable statistical results) given a specific Log_2(O/E) (Figure

S5B, solid line). This threshold was then applied to the Log_2(O/E) results, at both the

levels of variant types and pathways, to determine which of these were amenable to

further statistical testing where the results of this can be seen in the figure legends (e.g.

Figure 5B; Table S5). For the Log_2(O/E) non-synonymous/synonymous calculation, we

determined if these were amenable to further statistical testing if either the non-

synonymous or synonymous Log_2(O/E) results in each group reached the established

observed variant threshold (Table S5).

When assessing for mutation selection, it is also necessary to account for the cell-intrinsic

bias in mutation frequency due to DNA repair mechanisms (i.e. transcription coupled

repair), which is known to reduce mutation frequency in transcribed regions and is

agnostic to damage that would result in synonymous or non-synonymous variants [76].

This bias in mutation frequency was indeed observed in our data and consistent with a

depletion of mutations due to DNA repair (Figure 5I). Thus, we normalized the $Log_2(O/E)$

ratio of coding variants (e.g. synonymous, missense, etc.) and non-coding variants (5'/3'

UTR and splice region) by the $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio of mutations which occurred within intronic

regions and not in splice regions. We chose to use this normalization because the

occurrence of both exonic and intronic mutations is dependent on transcription coupled

repair [31] however, since intronic mutations do not alter the translated protein (with the

exception of splice site variants), they are not subject to selective mechanisms. In

addition, the majority of variants in our data occur within introns (~46.7%, Figure 5H),

allowing us to make more confident $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio for these mutations as compared to

using the $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio of synonymous mutations which only made up ~0.23% of all

variants. A comparison of unnormalized and normalized $Log_2(O/E)$ ratio for non-

synonymous and synonymous variants is shown for example by comparing Figures 5B

to S5C, where the effect of normalization can be seen to slightly increase the $Log_2(O/E)$

ratio.

To estimate the number of variants that are protected against resulting from negative

selection, we subtracted the average number of variants from simulated samples from

the number of variants in the respective observed sample.

<u>Selection analysis of gene sets and pathways</u>

Non-expressed and expressed genes were determined using bulk mRNA transcriptome

data from cycle 9 control and ENU-treated groups using the zPKM program (Figure S2A;

Table S7) [61]. Nonessential and essential control gene sets were obtained from the

DepMap database (depmap.org) [77], where the nonessential gene set was the negative

controls from Hart *et al* (2015) and the essential gene set was the intersection of the the

essential gene sets resulting from the Hart *et al* (2015) and Blomen *et al* (2014) studies

[42, 78]. These gene sets were filtered for expressed genes by overlapping them with the

list of expressed genes we determined previously (Table S7). Haplosufficient and

haploinsufficient gene sets were obtained from the ExAC database where haplosufficient

genes were defined as pLI < 0.1 and haploinsufficient genes were defined as pLI > 0.9

[47]. These gene sets were also filtered for expressed genes by overlapping them with

the list of expressed genes we determined previously (Table S7). Pathway genes were

obtained by performing over representation analysis for gene ontology biological

processes using the clusterProfiler program [63] on the list of expressed genes that

determined previously (Table S8). For all gene sets, genomic coordinates of exons,

introns, promoters (5KB upstream of transcription start site), and annotated enhancers

[38] were retrieved using the GenomicRanges (version 1.60.0) software [79].

For each gene set, two $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratios were calculated. One for the version of the gene

set where the intronic regions were included, and the other for the version of the gene set

intronic regions were excluded. To account for DNA repair (as previously described for

$\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ calculation of coding and non-coding variants), the $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratios of each

gene set was normalized by subtracting $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of the version that included

introns from the version that excluded introns. A permutation test was then used to

estimate p-values, as described above, and were adjusted for multiple hypothesis testing

using the Benjamini-Hochberg method.

To serve as a negative control for the pathway analysis, for each enriched biological

process gene set, we randomly shuffled the genes between all other identified biological

processes gene sets and created 10,000 randomly permuted gene sets. Average

$Log_2(O/E)$ ratios were then calculated for the 10,000 permutations of each gene set

followed by p-value estimation, as described above.

<u>Single-molecule mutation analysis</u>

DNA was extracted from frozen cell pellets using the Zymo DNA/RNA extraction kit

(Microprep plus D7005) according to the manufacturer's instructions and quantified using

a Qubit kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). Library preparation for single-molecule

mutation sequencing (SMM-Seq) was performed as previously described[22]. In brief,

200 ng gDNA was used as input for library construction and then fragmented using

restriction endonucleases Alu I and Mlu CI, followed by purification with AMPure XP

beads. The fragmented DNA was then processed with the NEBNext Ultra II DNA Library

Prep Kit for Illumina, utilizing a custom adapter. Post size selection with AMPure XP

beads, the product was quantified with a Qubit kit and analyzed on a TapeStation

(Agilent). For library preparation, samples were diluted based on molar concentration,

and 1 µl of the diluted sample was used as a template in a pulse-RCA reaction with a

strand displacement polymerase. The reaction product was purified, PCR-amplified, and

further purified before quantification and pooling for sequencing. Conventional whole-

genome sequencing (WGS) libraries that are used to identify germline variants were

similarly prepared by PCR amplification of adapter-ligated samples, followed by

purification, quantification, pooling, and sequencing as described above. WGS libraries

were sequenced using 150 paired-end mode on an Illumina Novoseq platform by

Novogene Corp Inc., CA.

<u>Single-molecule whole-genome read alignment and mutation calling</u>

Data analysis for SMM-Seq data was performed as previously described[22]. In brief, raw

sequence reads were adapter- and quality-trimmed, then aligned to the hg19 reference

genome. Realignment and recalibration were performed based on known indels. For

variant calling, filters were applied to ensure only high-quality reads (mapping quality ≥

60, in proper pairs, no secondary alignments) were considered. Positions covered by at

least seven reads from each strand within a UMI family and covered at least 20× in regular

sequencing were deemed qualified. Variants were identified if all reads within a UMI

family showed the same base, differing from the reference genome. Germline variants

were filtered out using a list of SNPs from the sample and dbSNP [80]Variants were

rejected if detected in different UMI families or conventional WGS data containing

germline variants. Somatic SNV frequency was calculated as the ratio of identified

variants to the total number of qualified positions. See Supplementary Note 2 for details

of analysis.

Supplementary Notes

<u>Supplementary Note 1</u>

Strong batch effects were found to be present during athe analysis of the bulk mRNA-

Seq data (Figures S1G-I), which could mask the effects of interest when comparing the

different groups. While the batch effect was corrected for during the differential expression

(DE) analysis by accounting for the batch variable in the generalized linear model utilized

by DESeq2 (Figures S1J-K), we also performed the DE analysis of ENU Cycle 9 vs

Control Cycle 9 after removing samples from the Control Cycle 1 group. After batch

correction, separation between the groups could be seen from principal component

analysis (Figure S1L). However, a very small number of genes were differentially

expressed, validating our findings then including the Control Cycle 3 group (Figure S1M).

Supplementary Note 2

We used our recently developed single-molecule assay (SMM-seq) to verify mutation

burden in 14 samples from control and ENU-treated groups collected in 3 independent

batches at cycles 1, 3, 6, and 9 at the 7-day time point (Figure 1A, Table S4). The number

of estimated SNVs per mega base (MB) increased from $4.03*10^{-1}\pm1.23*10^{-3}$ per MB in

the control group at cycle 1 to $1.95\pm9.55*10^{-2}$ in the ENU-treated group a cycle 3, i.e. a

4.8-fold increase (Figure 3B). At cycle 9, there was a ~14-fold increase in estimated SNVs

per MB in the ENU-treated group relative to the controls, where the total amount of

estimated SNVs per cell in the ENU-treated group reached $5.58\pm5.27*10^{-1}$ SNVs per MB.

Importantly, as found with the single-cell assay, we could not detect a significant

difference between controls from cycle 1 and cycle 9, which had an average frequency of

$4*10^{-1}\pm1*10^{-3}$and $5*10^{-1}\pm4*10^{-2}$ SNVs per MB, respectively. This indicates that the

culturing and passaging of the cells itself had very little impact on the mutational load.

Like for the single-cell assay, the accumulation of SNVs between the 1st and 9th cycle was

best fit by a linear model without evidence that a plateau had been reached (Figure 3D).

These results were highly correlative with the single-cell whole-genome sequencing

assay (Figure S3A), although the estimates tended to be lower. As the SMM-Seq method

uses a totally different single-molecule approach to overcome the issue of distinguishing

somatic mutations from sequencing errors and thus is subject to different technical

biases, it is expected that the estimated somatic mutation burden will differ between

SMM-Seq and SCMDA results, although the relative trends should be the same.

Moreover, the parameters which are used for the SMM-Seq analysis are tuned to

enhance specificity at the expense of sensitivity, which explains why SMM-Seq results

agree with SCMDA results at mutation burdens which are expected to occur

physiologically (< 1 SNV per 1 Mbp) and become conservative at higher burdens (> 1

SNV per 1 Mbp). Mutation spectra analysis indicated an increase in A>T transitions as

expected from ENU treatment (Figure S3B). Of note, the SMM-Seq obtains far fewer

observed mutations as compared to SCMDA, which constrains measuring selection

pressure (Table S4). Hence, while the SMM-Seq method essentially confirmed the single-

cell results, we based all our downstream analyses solely on the single-cell data.

<u>Supplementary Note 3</u>

Though relatively few INDELs were observed (369 total), the mutational spectra in ENU-

treated cells were characterized by an increase in thymine INDELs as well as INDELs

with a 5+bp deletion and microhomology relative to the controls (Figure S4E). Moreover,

a single *de novo* INDEL mutational signature could be extracted, which weakly resembled

COSMIC ID1 and ID2 (cosine similarity 0.59 & 0.54, respectively). Both have been

suggested to be due to slippage of the template strand during DNA replication in addition

to having "clock-like" behavior.

<u>Supplementary Note 4</u>

To test if the negative selection finding could be recapitulated with other software

calculates selection pressure, we used the dNdScv software with the default parameters

and as input we used the mutations from the control and ENU-treated groups. This

resulted in a global dN/dS ratio of 1 for all mutation types in all the ENU-treated groups,

indicative of neutral selection (Figure S6A). As these results conflicted with our own

results using the O/E method, we sought to determine what the differences were between

the two methods and if either of these was better suited to analyzing single-cell whole

genome sequencing data. We compared the counts of observed and expected for

synonymous (Figures S6B-F) and missense variants (Figures S6G-K) between the

methods, which led us to identify the main discrepancy: the approaches used to estimate

the expected number of variants (as hypothesized by the reviewer). The dndscv approach

calculates expected variants per gene based on probabilistic models of mutation rates

and sequence contexts[33]. In contrast, the O/E method uses SigProfilerSimulator to

empirically estimate expected variants by simulating mutations randomly across the

genome while accounting for coverage, sequence context, and mutational signatures[30].

Crucially, the dndscv model makes assumptions about uniform genomic coverage and

high mutation counts, conditions violated in our SCWGS data as it is characterized by

uneven coverage and relatively few coding mutations per cell (Figure S6A). Finally, an

argument against the null model generated by SigProfilerSimulator in the O/E method is

that due to its simplicity, it might not accurately reflect neutral selection as one would

expect (i.e. the null model does not represent neutral selection). However, when using

the 1,000 instances of simulated mutations generated from SigProfilerSimulator (based

on observed mutations from the control and ENU groups, respectively) as input to the

dndscv program, this produced a global dN/dS ratio of 1 for all variants, as would be

expected (Figure S6L). This means that the null model generated by SigProfilerSimulator

accurately models neutral selection pressure. In summary, while dN/dS is a powerful

metric for highly mutated cancer genomes, it lacks sensitivity to detect negative selection

in scenarios like ours with limited coding mutations and variable coverage across the

genome which is inherent to SCWGS. We conclude that empirically estimating expected

variants via simulations, as done in our O/E analysis, is better suited for such situations.

Supplementary Note 5

Given that there are enough observed variants for sufficient statistical power and after

accounting for DNA repair (Methods), negative Log_2O/E ratios suggest negative

selection because the frequency of observed variants is less than what would be

expected according to the null model. In contrast, positive Log_2O/E ratios do not

necessarily positive selection. This is because in the calculation of the Log_2O/E ratio,

while mutations are randomly re-distributed in the simulated samples according to the

null model, the total number of variants remains the same between observed and

simulated samples. This creates the potential for a see-saw effect as a depletion of

mutations in a large regions (i.e., introns, which make up ~25% of the genome) must be

balanced out. The consequence of this may be an inflated estimate of the Log_2O/E ratio

for other large regions (i.e., intergenic regions, which make up ~50% of the genome)

(Figure 5I), which warrants caution for the interpretation of these results. Despite this

potential limitation of the O/E method, we do believe that the resulting positive Log_2O/E

ratios for intergenic regions is reflective of the underlying biology, as this is supported by

previous evidence that intergenic regions lack DNA repair activity and are under neutral

selection[34, 35, 81].

<u>Supplementary Note 6</u>

Out of the 37 detected stop gain variants, 4 of these were in 4 different cancer driver

genes and had dN/dS ratios from ~70-1,000 when analyzing selection using dndscv,

though they were not significant after multiple hypothesis correction. However, these

particular variants could possibly explain the positively trending Log_2(O/E) ratio seen for

stop gain variants in the ENU-treated cells (Figure 5D). These variants were found in

ABL1 and *CDC73*, which are tumor suppressors while *CREB3L2* and *COL1A1* are

oncogenes. Thus, it may be possible that stop gain variants in ABL1 and CDC73 may

have provided a slight growth advantage that led it to being picked up in our analysis.

However, repeated passaging during ENU treatment creates a strong bottleneck that

limits clonal expansion. While 8 shared SNVs were detected between 2 cells, the

presence of ~9,000 unique SNVs per cell indicates these arose independently, arguing

against large clonal expansion (Supplementary Figure 2F). It will be interesting for further

studies which analyze larger numbers of somatic mutations in normal cells to see if this

may be true.

References
1. López-Otín, C., et al., *Hallmarks of aging: An expanding universe.* Cell, 2023.
186(2): p. 243-278.
2. Schumacher, B., et al., *The central role of DNA damage in the ageing process.*
Nature, 2021. **592**(7856): p. 695-703.
3. Failla, G., *The aging process and cancerogenesis.* Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1958. **71**(6):
p. 1124-40.
4. Szilard, L., *ON THE NATURE OF THE AGING PROCESS.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U
S A, 1959. **45**(1): p. 30-45.
5. Laconi, E., F. Marongiu, and J. DeGregori, *Cancer as a disease of old age:*
changing mutational and microenvironmental landscapes. Br J Cancer, 2020.
122(7): p. 943-952.
6. Ren, P., X. Dong, and J. Vijg, *Age-related somatic mutation burden in human*
tissues. Front Aging, 2022. **3**: p. 1018119.
7. Franco, I. and M. Eriksson, *Reverting to old theories of ageing with new evidence*
for the role of somatic mutations. Nat Rev Genet, 2022. **23**(11): p. 645-646.
8. Franco, I., G. Revêchon, and M. Eriksson, *Challenges of proving a causal role of*
somatic mutations in the aging process. Aging Cell, 2022. **21**(5): p. e13613.
9. Franco, I., et al., *Whole genome DNA sequencing provides an atlas of somatic*
mutagenesis in healthy human cells and identifies a tumor-prone cell type.
Genome Biol, 2019. **20**(1): p. 285.
10. Franco, I., et al., *Somatic mutagenesis in satellite cells associates with human*
skeletal muscle aging. Nat Commun, 2018. **9**(1): p. 800.
11. Lodato, M.A., et al., *Aging and neurodegeneration are associated with increased*
mutations in single human neurons. Science, 2018. **359**(6375): p. 555-559.
12. Erickson, R.P., *Somatic gene mutation and human disease other than cancer: an*
update. Mutat Res, 2010. **705**(2): p. 96-106.
13. Li, C. and S.M. Williams, *Human Somatic Variation: It's Not Just for Cancer*
Anymore. Current Genetic Medicine Reports, 2013. **1**(4): p. 212-218.
14. Abyzov, A., et al., *One thousand somatic SNVs per skin fibroblast cell set baseline*
of mosaic mutational load with patterns that suggest proliferative origin. Genome
Res, 2017. **27**(4): p. 512-523.
15. Laurie, C.C., et al., *Detectable clonal mosaicism from birth to old age and its*
relationship to cancer. Nat Genet, 2012. **44**(6): p. 642-50.
16. Abyzov, A., et al., *Somatic copy number mosaicism in human skin revealed by*
induced pluripotent stem cells. Nature, 2012. **492**(7429): p. 438-42.
17. Jaiswal, S., et al., *Age-related clonal hematopoiesis associated with adverse*
outcomes. N Engl J Med, 2014. **371**(26): p. 2488-98.
18. Sender, R. and R. Milo, *The distribution of cellular turnover in the human body.* Nat
Med, 2021. **27**(1): p. 45-48.

19. Barbaric, I., et al., *Spectrum of ENU-induced mutations in phenotype-driven and*
gene-driven screens in the mouse. Environ Mol Mutagen, 2007. **48**(2): p. 124-42.

20. Dong, X., et al., *Accurate identification of single-nucleotide variants in whole-*
genome-amplified single cells. Nat Methods, 2017. **14**(5): p. 491-493.

21. Zhang, L., et al., *Analyzing somatic mutations by single-cell whole-genome*
sequencing. Nat Protoc, 2024. **19**(2): p. 487-516.

22. Maslov, A.Y., et al., *Single-molecule, quantitative detection of low-abundance*
somatic mutations by high-throughput sequencing. Sci Adv, 2022. **8**(14): p.
eabm3259.

23. Watson, D.E., M.L. Cunningham, and K.R. Tindall, *Spontaneous and ENU-*
induced mutation spectra at the cII locus in Big Blue Rat2 embryonic fibroblasts.
Mutagenesis, 1998. **13**(5): p. 487-97.

24. Alexandrov, L.B., et al., *The repertoire of mutational signatures in human cancer.*
Nature, 2020. **578**(7793): p. 94-101.

25. Huang, Z., et al., *Single-cell analysis of somatic mutations in human bronchial*
epithelial cells in relation to aging and smoking. Nat Genet, 2022. **54**(4): p. 492-
498.

26. Miller, M.B., et al., *Somatic genomic changes in single Alzheimer's disease*
neurons. Nature, 2022. **604**(7907): p. 714-722.

27. Kucab, J.E., et al., *A Compendium of Mutational Signatures of Environmental*
Agents. Cell, 2019. **177**(4): p. 821-836 e16.

28. Hwang, T., et al., *Comprehensive whole-genome sequencing reveals origins of*
mutational signatures associated with aging, mismatch repair deficiency and
temozolomide chemotherapy. Nucleic Acids Res, 2025. **53**(1).

29. McLaren, W., et al., *The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor.* Genome Biol, 2016.
17(1): p. 122.

30. Bergstrom, E.N., et al., *Generating realistic null hypothesis of cancer mutational*
landscapes using SigProfilerSimulator. BMC Bioinformatics, 2020. **21**(1): p. 438.

31. Heilbrun, E.E., M. Merav, and S. Adar, *Exons and introns exhibit transcriptional*
strand asymmetry of dinucleotide distribution, damage formation and DNA repair.
NAR Genom Bioinform, 2021. **3**(1): p. lqab020.

32. Frigola, J., et al., *Reduced mutation rate in exons due to differential mismatch*
repair. Nat Genet, 2017. **49**(12): p. 1684-1692.

33. Martincorena, I., et al., *Universal Patterns of Selection in Cancer and Somatic*
Tissues. Cell, 2017. **171**(5): p. 1029-1041.e21.

34. Dukler, N., et al., *Extreme purifying selection against point mutations in the human*
genome. Nat Commun, 2022. **13**(1): p. 4312.

35. Yurchenko, A.A., et al., *Genomic mutation landscape of skin cancers from DNA*
repair-deficient xeroderma pigmentosum patients. Nat Commun, 2023. **14**(1): p.
2561.

36. Denisov, S.V., et al., *Weak negative and positive selection and the drift load at*
splice sites. Genome Biol Evol, 2014. **6**(6): p. 1437-47.

37. Findlay, S.D., L. Romo, and C.B. Burge, *Quantifying negative selection in human*
3' UTRs uncovers constrained targets of RNA-binding proteins. Nat Commun,
2024. **15**(1): p. 85.

38. Boix, C.A., et al., *Regulatory genomic circuitry of human disease loci by integrative epigenomics.* Nature, 2021. **590**(7845): p. 300-307.

39. Carlson M, M.B. *TxDb.Hsapiens.UCSC.hg19.knownGene: Annotation package for TxDb object(s).* 2015; Available from: https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/data/annotation/html/TxDb.Hsapiens.UCSC.hg19.knownGene.html.

40. Boix, C.A. *EpiMap Repository.* 2023; Available from: https://compbio.mit.edu/epimap/.

41. Wang, T., et al., *Identification and characterization of essential genes in the human genome.* Science, 2015. **350**(6264): p. 1096-101.

42. Hart, T., et al., *High-Resolution CRISPR Screens Reveal Fitness Genes and Genotype-Specific Cancer Liabilities.* Cell, 2015. **163**(6): p. 1515-26.

43. Lawson, A.R.J., et al., *Somatic mutation and selection at epidemiological scale.* medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.10.30.24316422.

44. Vorontsov, I.E., et al., *Negative selection maintains transcription factor binding motifs in human cancer.* BMC Genomics, 2016. **17 Suppl 2**(Suppl 2): p. 395.

45. Bányai, L., et al., *Use of signals of positive and negative selection to distinguish cancer genes and passenger genes.* Elife, 2021. **10**.

46. Zapata, L., et al., *Negative selection in tumor genome evolution acts on essential cellular functions and the immunopeptidome.* Genome Biol, 2018. **19**(1): p. 67.

47. Lek, M., et al., *Analysis of protein-coding genetic variation in 60,706 humans.* Nature, 2016. **536**(7616): p. 285-91.

48. Nowell, P.C., *The clonal evolution of tumor cell populations.* Science, 1976. **194**(4260): p. 23-8.

49. Group, U.S.C.S.W., *US cancer statistics: 1999–2009 incidence and mortality web-based report.* 2013, USDHHS, CDC: Atlanta GA.

50. Burnet, F.M., *Intrinsic mutagenesis: a genetic basis of ageing.* Pathology, 1974. **6**(1): p. 1-11.

51. Ng, S.W.K., et al., *Convergent somatic mutations in metabolism genes in chronic liver disease.* Nature, 2021. **598**(7881): p. 473-478.

52. Robinson, P.S., et al., *Increased somatic mutation burdens in normal human cells due to defective DNA polymerases.* Nat Genet, 2021. **53**(10): p. 1434-1442.

53. Karczewski, K.J., et al., *The mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans.* Nature, 2020. **581**(7809): p. 434-443.

54. Zhang, X., et al., *Genetic constraint at single amino acid resolution in protein domains improves missense variant prioritisation and gene discovery.* Genome Med, 2024. **16**(1): p. 88.

55. Gudkov, M., L. Thibaut, and E. Giannoulatou, *Context-adjusted proportion of singletons (CAPS): a novel metric for assessing negative selection in the human genome.* NAR Genom Bioinform, 2024. **6**(3): p. lqae111.

56. Zhang, L., et al., *Single-cell whole-genome sequencing reveals the functional landscape of somatic mutations in B lymphocytes across the human lifespan.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2019. **116**(18): p. 9014-9019.

57. Hård, J., et al., *Long-read whole-genome analysis of human single cells.* Nature Communications, 2023. **14**(1): p. 5164.

58. Yang, L., *A Practical Guide for Structural Variation Detection in the Human Genome.* Curr Protoc Hum Genet, 2020. **107**(1): p. e103.

59. Ewels, P.A., et al., *The nf-core framework for community-curated bioinformatics pipelines.* Nat Biotechnol, 2020. **38**(3): p. 276-278.

60. Patel, H., et al., *nf-core/rnaseq: nf-core/rnaseq v3.1.0.* Vol. 3.1.0. 2024.

61. Hart, T., et al., *Finding the active genes in deep RNA-seq gene expression studies.* BMC Genomics, 2013. **14**: p. 778.

62. Love, M.I., W. Huber, and S. Anders, *Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2.* Genome Biol, 2014. **15**(12): p. 550.

63. Wu, T., et al., *clusterProfiler 4.0: A universal enrichment tool for interpreting omics data.* Innovation (Camb), 2021. **2**(3): p. 100141.

64. Saul, D., et al., *A new gene set identifies senescent cells and predicts senescence-associated pathways across tissues.* Nat Commun, 2022. **13**(1): p. 4827.

65. Kanehisa, M. and S. Goto, *KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2000. **28**(1): p. 27-30.

66. Gundry, M., et al., *Direct, genome-wide assessment of DNA mutations in single cells.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2012. **40**(5): p. 2032-40.

67. *FastQC.* 2015.

68. Krueger, F., *Trim galore.* A wrapper tool around Cutadapt and FastQC to consistently apply quality and adapter trimming to FastQ files, 2015. **516**(517): p. 517.

69. DePristo, M.A., et al., *A framework for variation discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data.* Nature Genetics, 2011. **43**(5): p. 491-498.

70. Petljak, M., et al., *Characterizing Mutational Signatures in Human Cancer Cell Lines Reveals Episodic APOBEC Mutagenesis.* Cell, 2019. **176**(6): p. 1282-1294.e20.

71. Zhang, L., et al., *Analysis of Somatic Mutations in Senescent Cells Using Single-Cell Whole-Genome Sequencing.* Aging Biol, 2023. **1**(1).

72. Blokzijl, F., et al., *MutationalPatterns: comprehensive genome-wide analysis of mutational processes.* Genome Med, 2018. **10**(1): p. 33.

73. Sun, S., et al., *SomaMutDB: a database of somatic mutations in normal human tissues.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2022. **50**(D1): p. D1100-d1108.

74. Sondka, Z., et al., *COSMIC: a curated database of somatic variants and clinical data for cancer.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2024. **52**(D1): p. D1210-d1217.

75. Degasperi, A., et al., *A practical framework and online tool for mutational signature analyses show inter-tissue variation and driver dependencies.* Nat Cancer, 2020. **1**(2): p. 249-263.

76. Selby, C.P., et al., *Molecular Mechanisms of Transcription-Coupled Repair.* Annu Rev Biochem, 2023. **92**: p. 115-144.

77. Broad, D., *DepMap 24Q4 Public.* 2024, Figshare+.

78. Blomen, V.A., et al., *Gene essentiality and synthetic lethality in haploid human cells.* Science, 2015. **350**(6264): p. 1092-6.

79. Lawrence, M., et al., *Software for computing and annotating genomic ranges.* PLoS Comput Biol, 2013. **9**(8): p. e1003118.

80. Sherry, S.T., et al., *dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2001. **29**(1): p. 308-11.

1082   81.   Krasovec, M., et al., *Spontaneous Mutation Rate in the Smallest Photosynthetic*
1083   *Eukaryotes.* Mol Biol Evol, 2017. **34**(7): p. 1770-1779.

1084

Figure 1. Repeated Mutagen Treatment of Normal Cells Only Slightly Affects Cell Growth

(A) Schematic depiction of experimental design. Human fetal lung fibroblasts (IMR-90) were treated with a sublethal dose of 50 µg/mL of N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea (ENU), which was followed by a recovery period of 7 days. At 3-day and 7-day time points, 1 million cells were passaged and a sample was taken for further analysis. This process was repeated for 9 cycles.

(B) Cumulative population doublings (PDs) of the control (CTRL) and ENU-treated (ENU) groups throughout the experiment. Statistics: n=3; Data represent mean ± S.D.; P-value estimated using a two-way repeated measures ANOVA.

(C) Cumulative PDs of the CTRL and ENU groups assessed at the 3-day time point. Statistics as in (B).

(D) Cumulative PDs of the CTRL and ENU groups at the 7-day time point. Statistics as in (B).

(E) Percentage of cells detected in early apoptosis at the 3-day time point at each cycle (left) or with all cycles pooled (right). Statistics: n=2; Data represent mean ± S.D.; P-value of data from each cycle was estimated using a two-way repeated measures ANOVA. P-value of data from all cycles pooled was estimated using a paired t-test; **: p <= 0.005; ****: p<= 0.0001.

(F) Percentage of cells detected in late apoptosis at the 3-day time point at each cycle (left) or with all cycles pooled (right). Statistics as in (E).

(G) Percentage of cells detected in early apoptosis at the 7-day time point at each cycle (left) or with all cycles pooled (right). Statistics as in (E).

(H) Percentage of cells detected in late apoptosis at the 7-day time point at each cycle (left) or with all cycles pooled (right). Statistics as in (E).

Figure 2. RNA-Sequencing Reveals Increased Cell Cycle Inhibition and Apoptosis in ENU-treated Cells

(A) Differential gene expression (DGE) of the control cycle 9 vs. control cycle 1 comparison. Red points in are Log_2 fold change>2 and adjusted p-value<0.05. See Table S2 for detailed results. Statistics: DGE results obtained using Wald test followed by Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing.

(B-D) Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) of DGE results from the control cycle 9 vs. control cycle 1 comparison for KEGG cell cycle (B), KEGG apoptosis (C), and SenMayo senescence (D) gene sets. Statistics: NES = normalized enrichment score, p-values obtained using a permutation test.

(E) Same as in (A), but for the ENU-treated cycle 9 vs. control cycle 9 comparison. See Table S2 for detailed results. Statistics: Same as in (A).

(F-H) Same as in (B-D), but for the ENU-treated cycle 9 vs. control cycle 9 comparison. Statistics: Same as in (B-D).

Statistics for all panels: n=3. See Table S1 for sample details.

Figure 3. Repeated Mutagen Treatment of Normal Cells Results in Extremely High Mutation Burden.

(A) Estimated load of somatic single nucleotide variants (SNVs) per cell corrected for genome coverage and sensitivity. See figure S2H for observed SNV load per cell. Statistics: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; data represent mean ± S.D. p-values of comparisons between cycles within the same condition were estimated with a two-sided linear model with estimated marginal means, Tukey's HSD. P-values of comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA and shown at very top of plot. p-value legend: ****: p <= 0.0001.

(B) Estimated frequency of somatic SNVs per megabase (MB) using the SMM-Seq method. See supplemental note 2 for details of this analysis. See figure S3A for comparison of single-cell and single-molecule mutation burden estimates. Statistics: n=3; same as in (A).

(C) Fit of linear model to estimated SNV load per cell shown in (A) vs. the treatment cycle cells were collected at. Control cycle 9 is omitted. Shown at top is the fit of a linear equation. Statistics: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; data represent mean ± S.D.; Pearson R correlation coefficient and p-value of the correlation was estimated using a T-test.

(D) Fit of linear model to estimated frequency of SNVs per MB shown in (B) vs. the treatment cycle cells were collected at. Control cycle 9 is omitted. Shown at the top is the fit of a linear equation. Statistics: n=3; Same as in (C).

See Tables S3-4 for sample details.

Figure 4. Mutational Spectra And Signatures Resulting From Repeated Mutagen Treatment

(A) Mutational spectra of the relative contribution of SNV types per cell grouped by condition. See figure S4A for groups stratified by cycle. Note that cells from the control cycle 1 group were excluded from the mutational spectra and signatures analyses due to abnormally high C>T frequency suggestive of a sample preparation artifact (Figures S4F-G; Methods). Statistics: n=3 cells for cycles 3 and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.

(**B**) Relative contribution of *de novo* mutational signatures SBSA and SBSB to individual cells (shown as rows) grouped by condition and cycle. See figure S4I for determination of number of signatures to extract.

(C) Comparison of *de novo* mutational signature SBSA to the ENU signature from the SIGNAL database. Statistics: cosine similarity 0.858, residual sum of squares=7.83*10^-3.

(D) Comparison of *de novo* mutational signature SBSB to most similar fitted signature SBS5 from the COSMIC database. Statistics: cosine similarity=0.955, residual sum of squares= 1.79*10^-3.

Figure 5. Negative Selection Against Damaging Coding and Non-Coding Variants in ENU-treated Cells.
(A) Observed frequency of synonymous and non-synonymous variants per cell. Statistics: P-values for comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA.
(B) Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants for ENU-treated cells. See figures S5C, S5D, and S5E for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. Statistics: P-values to assess if the Log$_2$(O/E) ratio significantly deviates from 0 were estimated using a permutation test (n=10,000). P-values were only estimated if the frequency of observed variants allowed for sufficiency statistical power (Figure S5B; Table S5).
(C) Estimated percent of non-synonymous variants out of total coding variants that are protected against in the ENU-treated group due to negative selection.
(D) Observed frequency of various types of non-synonymous variants per cell. Statistics: Same as in (A)
(E) Log$_2$O/E of various types of non-synonymous variants for ENU-treated cells. See figures S5F, S5G, and S5H for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. Statistics: Same as in (B).
(F) Ratio of observed non-synonymous to synonymous (N/S) variants per cell.
(G) Log$_2$O/E of the N/S ratio for ENU-treated cells. See figures S5I and S5J for results of control cells and per cell, respectively. Statistics: Same as in (B).
(H) Observed frequency of various types of non-coding variants per cell. Statistics: Same as in (A)
(I) Log$_2$O/E of various types of non-coding variants for ENU-treated cells. See figures S5K, S5L, and S5M for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. See Supplementary Note 5 for discussion on results of the intergenic region. Statistics: Same as in (B).
(J) Estimated percent reduction of variants in 3' UTR and splice region variants that are protected against in the ENU-treated group due to negative selection.
Statistics for all panels: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.; p-value legend: ns: p > 0.05; *: p <= 0.05; **: p <= 0.01; ***: p <= 0.001; ****: p <= 0.0001

Figure 6. Pathways Supporting Fibroblast Growth and Cell Identity are Protected from Mutation Accumulation

(A) Observed frequency of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with genes that were determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data (Table S7). Statistics: P-values of comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA.

(B) Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with genes determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data for ENU-treated cells. See figures S7A, S7B, and S7C for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. Statistics: P-values to assess if the Log$_2$(O/E) ratio significantly deviates from 0 were estimated using a permutation test (n=10,000). P-values were only estimated if the frequency of observed variants allowed for sufficiency statistical power (Figure S5B; Table S9).

(C) Observed frequency of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to nonessential or essential gene sets for ENU-treated cells. Statistics: Same in in (A).

(D) Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to nonessential or essential gene sets for ENU-treated cells. See figures S7D, S7E, and S7F for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. Statistics: Same as in (B).

(E) Observed frequency of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to haplosufficient or haploinsufficient gene sets for control and ENU-treated cells. Statistics: Same in in (A).

(F) Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to haplosufficient or haploinsufficient gene sets for ENU-treated cells. See figures S7G, S7H, and S7I for results of control cells, without normalization, and per cell, respectively. Statistics: Same as in (B).

(G) Mean observed frequency of SNVs within the functional regions of expressed pathways. See figure S7J for top 20 most enriched pathways. Statistics: n=399 pathways; P-values of comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA**.**

(H) Mean Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs within the functional regions of expressed pathways. See figure S7K and S7L for results of control cell and without normalization, respectively. Statistics: n=399 pathways; Same as in (B), with the addition of Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing of pathways.

(I-K) Mean Log$_2$(O/E) ratio (I), estimated percent reduction in SNVs (J), and estimated reduction in SNV frequency (K) in functional regions of pathways found to be under significant negative selection at cycle 9 in the ENU-treated group. Statistics for all panels: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.; p-value legend: ns: p > 0.05; *: p <= 0.05; **: p <= 0.01; ***: p <= 0.001; ****: p <= 0.0001

Supplementary Figure 1 | Transcriptome Analysis Quality Control and Extended Analysis. Related to Figure 2.

(A) Gene abundance distribution of each sample showing unfiltered distribution (blue) and the Gaussian fit to the Log2(FPKM) transcript abundances, which represents the filtering threshold used to identify expressed genes used in downstream analyses.

(B) Number of genes detected at TPM > 1.

(C-E) Correlation of Log2(TPM) data between biological replicates in control cycle 1 (C), control cycle 9 (D), and ENU-treated cycle 9 (E) groups. Statistics: n=16,133; Pearson R correlation coefficient; p-value were estimated using a t-test; p-value legend: ***: p <= 0.001.

(F) Distribution of DESeq2 normalized Log2(counts+1) transcript abundances.

(G) Principle component analysis (PCA) of all samples.

(H) Percent of variance explained by each PC.

(I) Correlation of each PC to experimental variables, showing the batch effect that is captured by the first PC. Statistics: n=3; Pearson R correlation coefficient; p-value were estimated using a t-test. **: p <= 0.01.

(J) PCA of all samples after adjusting for the batch variable (Methods).

(K) Correlation of each PC to experimental variables after batch correction, showing a lack of correlation of the batch variable with the first 6 PCs. Statistics: Same as in (I).

(L) PCA of samples only from cycle 9 after adjusting for the batch variable (Methods). See supplemental note 1 for details on the purpose of this analysis.

(M) DGE results of ENU-treated cycle 9 vs. control cycle 9 when only analyzing cycle 9 samples after adjusting for the batch variable. Red points are Log2 fold change>2 and adjusted p-value<0.05. Statistics: n=3; DGE results obtained using Wald test followed by Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing.

Supplementary Figure 2 | Single-Cell Whole Genome Analysis Quality Control and Observed Mutational Burden. Related to Figure 3.

(A) Percentage of genome covered at 20X read depth per cell.

(B-C) Sensitivity of SNV (B) and INDEL (C) mutation calling (Methods).

(D-E) Number of observed SNVs (D) and INDELs (E) removed from cells collected in the same cycle and batch that shared SNVs and INDELs (Methods).

(F-G) Number of observed shared SNVs and INDELs amongst all cells after filtering for mutations shared within each cycle and batch (Methods).

(H-I) Observed SNVs (H), INDELs (I) per cell. Statistics: Data represent mean ± S.D

(J) Estimated burden of somatic short insertions/deletions and (INDELs) per cell corrected for genome coverage and sensitivity. Statistics: Data represent mean ± S.D; p-values of comparisons between cycles within the same condition were estimated with a two-sided linear model with estimated marginal means, Tukey's HSD. p-values of comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA and are shown at top of plots; p-value legend ***: p <= 0.001

Statistics for all panels: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9

Supplementary Figure 3 | Comparison of Single-Cell and Single-Molecule Whole Genome Analyses. Related to Figure 3.

(A) Comparison of estimated SNV burden between the single-cell whole genome sequencing (scWGS) and single-molecule mutation sequencing (SMM-seq) assays matched by biological replicate. X- and Y-axis shown on Log_{10} scale. Related to figures 3A-B. Statistics: n=2-3; Shown at top is Pearson R correlation coefficient and p-value of the correlation that was estimate using a T-test.

(B) Mutation spectra of the relative contribution of SNV types for all samples within the same cycle and condition. Note the increase in the proportion of T>A base transversions, which is characteristic of ENU-induced mutations. Related to figure 3B. Statistics: n=2-3

Supplementary Figure 4 | Extended analysis of Mutational Spectra and Signatures. Related to Figure 4.

(A) Mutation spectra of the relative contribution of SNV types per cell separated by cycle and condition. Note the abnormal increase of C>T transition indicative of a technical artifact in control cycle 1 group, which was removed from downstream signature analysis (Methods). Related to figure 4A. Statistics: Data represent mean ± S.D.; n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9

(B) Results of determining optimal factorization rank for SNV signature extraction using non-negative matrix factorization, where a rank of 2 was chosen to extract 2 mutational signatures from the mutation data. Related to figure 4B.

(C) Mutational profile of control cycle 1 group, showing higher than expected cytosine-to-thymine (C>T) transversions at G<u>C</u>N contexts. Statistics: n=3

(D) Comparison of the only mutational signature extracted from the control cycle 1 group, SBSA, to a known single cell library preparation artifact SBS scF. See Methods for details on the exclusion of this group from this analysis. Statistics: n=3; cosine similarity=0.771, residual sum of squares=2.29*10^{-2}

(E) Estimated burden of somatic single nucleotide variants (SNVs) per cell in the control groups corrected for genome coverage, sensitivity, and the scF sequencing artifact mutational signature (C-D). This artifact increased the proportion of C>T transitions by 18% ± 1%. With this, we estimated the amount of artifactual C>T transitions in control cells at cycle 1, subtracted this from the observed mutation burden, and then re-estimated the SNVs per cell. Statistics: n=3 cells for cycle 1; n=6 cells for cycle 9; data represent mean ± S.D.

(F) INDEL mutation spectra grouped by condition. See supplemental note 3 for detailed description of each spectrum. Statistics: n=6 cells for control group; n=12 cells for ENU-treated group.

Supplementary Figure 5 | Extended Analysis of Negative Selection Against Damaging Coding and Non-Coding Variants in ENU-treated Cells. Related to Figure 5.

(A) Standard deviation of expected (simulated) variants as a function of observed variant frequency. The data was fit to a gamma GLM with a log link (red line) Statistics: Residual deviance = 3.19 on 144 df vs. null deviance = 147.37 on 145 df; dispersion = 0.020; log-transformed observed variant count was a highly significant predictor of expected variant standard deviation, irrespective of the variant type ($p < 2 \times 10^{-16}$).

(B) P-value as a function of simulations of the observed variant count and the $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ to determine the number of observed variants given the $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ that is needed to reliably interpret the resulting statistical test.

(C) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5B.

(D) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants for control cells, related to figure 5B.

(E) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants per cell, related to figure 5B.

(F) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5E.

(G) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants for control cells, related to figure 5E.

(H) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants per cell, related to figure 5E.

(I) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of the non-synonymous / synonymous (N/S) ratio for control cells, related to figure 5G.

(J) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of the non-synonymous / synonymous (N/S) ratio per cell for control and ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5G.

(K) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5I.

(L) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants for control cells, related to figure 5I.

(M) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants per cell, related to figure 5I.

Statistics for all panels: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.

Supplementary Figure 6 | dN/dS analysis of selection pressure for damaging coding variants. Related to Figure 5.

(A) Standard deviation of expected (simulated) variants as a function of observed variant frequency. The data was fit to a gamma GLM with a log link (red line) Statistics: Residual deviance = 3.19 on 144 df vs. null deviance = 147.37 on 145 df; dispersion = 0.020; log-transformed observed variant count was a highly significant predictor of expected variant standard deviation, irrespective of the variant type ($p < 2 \times 10^{-16}$).

(B) P-value as a function of simulations of the observed variant count and the $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ to determine the number of observed variants given the $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ that is needed to reliably interpret the resulting statistical test.

(C) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5B.

(D) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants for control cells, related to figure 5B.

(E) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of synonymous and non-synonymous variants per cell, related to figure 5B.

(F) $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of the non-synonymous / synonymous (N/S) ratio for control cells, related to figure 5G.

(G) Same as in (F), but per cell, related to figure 5G.

(H) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5E.

(I) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants for control cells, related to figure 5E.

(J) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of coding variants per cell, related to figure 5E.

(K) Unnormalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants for ENU-treated cells, related to figure 5I.

(L) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants for control cells, related to figure 5I.

(M) Normalized $\text{Log}_2(\text{O/E})$ ratio of non-coding variants per cell, related to figure 5I.

Statistics for all panels: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.

Supplementary Figure 7 | Extended Selection Pressure Analysis of Mutation Accumulation at the Pathway Level. Related to Figure 6.
(A) Unnormalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with genes determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data for ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6B. Statistics: n=3 cells for cycles 1, 3, and 6; n=6 cells for cycle 9; Data represent mean ± S.D.
(B) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with genes determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data for control cells. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(C) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with genes determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data for control and ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6B. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(D) Unnormalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to nonessential or essential gene sets for ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6C. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(E) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to nonessential or essential gene sets for control cells. Related to figure 6C. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(F) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to nonessential or essential gene sets for control and ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6C. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(G) Unnormalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to haplosufficient or haploinsufficient gene sets for ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6F. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(H) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to haplosufficient or haploinsufficient gene sets for control cells. Related to figure 6F. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(I) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with expressed genes belonging to haplosufficient or haploinsufficient gene sets for control and ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6F. Related to figure 6B. Statistics same as in (A).
(J) Top 20 gene ontology biological processes out of 399 resulting from gene set over representation analysis of expressed genes from bulk mRNA transcriptome data from control and ENU-treated cells at cycle 9. Statistics: n=6; adjusted p-values estimated using a hypergeometric distribution test followed by Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing. Log$_2$ O/E ratio of SNVs per cell in functional regions associated with genes determined to be non-expressed or expressed from bulk mRNA transcriptome data from control and ENU-treated cells at cycle 9. Related to figures 6G-H.
(K) Unnormalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in the functional regions of expressed pathways for ENU-treated cells. Related to figure 6G. Statistics: P-values for comparing the frequency of observed variants to that expected by chance alone were estimated using a permutation test (n=10,000) with Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing.
(L) Normalized Log$_2$(O/E) ratio of SNVs in the functional regions of expressed pathways for control cells. Related to figure 6G. Statistics: Same as in (K).

Supplementary Figure 8 | Negative Control to Validate Negative Selection of Functional Pathways. Related to Figure 6.
(A) Mean observed frequency of SNVs within the functional regions of expressed pathways after shuffling genes between pathways (negative control). Statistics: n=399 pathways; p-values of comparisons of control and ENU-treated groups were estimated using a two-way ANOVA.
(B) Mean Log_2(O/E) ratio of SNVs within the functional regions of expressed pathways for ENU-treated cells after shuffling genes between pathways (negative control). Statistics: P-values to assess if the Log_2(O/E) ratio significantly deviates from 0 were estimated using a permutation test (n=10,000) with the addition of Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple hypothesis testing of pathways. P-values were only estimated if the frequency of observed variants allowed for sufficiency statistical power (Figure S5B).
(C) Normalized Log_2(O/E) ratio of SNVs in the functional regions of expressed for control cells. pathways after shuffling genes between pathways (negative control). Statistics: Same as in (B).
(D-E) Overlap of pathways that show significant negative O/E ratios (i.e. pathways under negative selection) at cycle 9 in the ENU-treated group at an adjusted p-value<0.05 threshold (C) or an adjusted p-value<0.1 threshold (D) resulting from the original non-shuffled analysis or shuffled analysis (negative control).